

REMARKS**Rejections under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Office Action alleged that the specification does not define how a filter is built with respect to filtering means. The Office Action indicated that a specific filtering condition does not appear to be defined with respect to applying a filtering condition. Contrary to the above allegations, pages 19-26 of the specification, which refer to figures including Figures 12 and 13, define how specific filtering conditions are built. Beginning on page 19, line 15, the written description provides, “With reference to those figures, how filter definition information is registered in the enterprise information filtering system according to the embodiment of the present invention will be described.” Beginning on page 20, line 23, the written description provides an example of how a specific filtering condition is built pertaining to a user’s request of “sales result” information: “With regards to the contents ‘sales result,’ a filtering condition is defined to select solely information where the attribute value of ‘product’ of ‘sales result’ is equal to ‘charge’ of ‘organization definition’” (see also Figure 13). Thus, the user’s request of “sales result” information is correlated to a type of information – in this example, “product” – that is stored in the enterprise information filtering system. As explained in Figure 10, the attribute “product” is defined as the “product taken in charge of by person.” Beginning on page 23, line 22, the written description describes building a specific filtering condition upon receiving the request by the user Kanda of “sales result” information. The “sales result” requested by Kanda is correlated to the attribute “product” that is stored in the system. In reference to Figure 11b, the product for which Kanda takes charge is “PC.” Therefore, as depicted in page 24, line 5, the filtering condition that is built is: “sales result. product = ‘PC.’” The application of this filter, when applied to the set of information shown in Figure 16, produces the sales result information pertaining only to the product “PC,” as depicted in Figure 17c.

At least for the reasons explained above, it is submitted that the specification fully and completely complies with the requirements of the first paragraph of § 112 and thus, the Examiner’s rejection must be withdrawn.

Rejections under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112

The term “management span”

In Paragraph 10, the Office Action alleged that the limitation “management span” was vague and that the term “management span” was not defined in the written description. Contrary to this allegation, the term “management span” is defined in the written description, beginning from page 2, line 25: “That is, in some cases, the contents Mb3 stored in the contents storage 3b do not correspond to a management span which specifies a range that the user must be responsible for management.” Beginning on page 24, line 8, the written description elaborates on this definition: “Next, the filtering execution unit 23 uses management span information, which is included in the organization definition information M31 and which represents the management responsibility range of each post, to check if the user has any subordinate for which the user has management responsibility.”

Furthermore, the “organization definition information” provided in Figure 8 and the information provided in Figure 11b present an example of management span information within an enterprise. In reference to Figure 8, the individual corresponding to employer ID (“uid”) X01 sits at the very top of the management hierarchy of “Company AB.” In reference to Figure 11b, the individual corresponding to uid X01 is Ichiro Kawato, who carries the title of “President” of “Company AB.” In reference to Figure 8, the employer IDs of individuals sitting in the layer immediately under that of Ichiro Kawato are X02 and X03, corresponding to “Division A” and “Division B,” respectively. Figure 11b identifies the individuals corresponding to uid values X02 and X03: Jiro Anzai, who carries the title of “Head of Division” of “Division A,” and Saburo Minami, who carries the title of “Head of Division” of “Division B.”

As explained above, the written description clearly defines the term “management span.” In response to the rejection set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Office Action, Applicant presented new claims 10-15 that refer to the concept of the “management span” without using that term *per se*. For example, claim 10 recites, “organization definition information, which includes information regarding layers of a multi-layered structure of an enterprise, including names of the layers, positions of the layers with respect to other layers and names of persons assigned to the layers and additional information regarding the persons, including

management responsibilities.”

Since, as indicated above, the term “management span” is clearly defined in the specification, and moreover, since the term is *per se* no longer used in the claims, it is submitted that the § 112, Paragraph 2 rejection should be withdrawn.

The term “post”

Paragraph 10 of the Office Action also contained an allegation that the term “post” was indefinite. The Office Action indicated that the “term ‘post’ in claims 1, 4 and 7 is used by the claims to mean ‘file,’ while the accepted meaning is ‘to submit an article in a newsgroup or other online forum.’” Contrary to this allegation, to one skilled in the art, it should be apparent from the context of the specification that the term “post” was used in the claims to mean “an office or position to which a person is appointed” (see entry #6 corresponding to the word “post” at www.m-w.com). In response to the rejection set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Office Action, Applicant presented new claims 10-15 that include the concept of the term “post” without using that term *per se*. For example, claim 10 recites “positions of the layers with respect to other layers” in the multi-layered structure of an enterprise.

Since, as indicated above, the term “post” is clearly defined in the specification, and moreover, since the term is *per se* no longer used in the claims, it is submitted that the § 112, Paragraph 2 rejection should be withdrawn.

The term “filtering condition”

Finally, paragraph 10 of the Office Action alleged that the term “filtering condition” was vague, indicating that the specification appears not to define either a specific filtering condition technique or the limitation pertaining to “information necessary for performing a job.” For the reasons stated above in connection with § 112, Paragraph 1, the specification fully and completely complies with the requirements of the first paragraph of § 112, and the phrase “filtering condition” is deemed to be clear and precise within the meaning of § 112, Paragraph 2. In response to the rejection set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Office Action, Applicant presented new claims 10-15 that include a recitation of “filtering condition” using

the disclosures to clarify the terminology. For example, claim 10 recites, “combining the type of information requested by a user of the enterprise information filtering system and the correlated type of organization definition information to create a filtering condition to be used by the enterprise information filtering system” (see pages 20-21 of the specification). Lastly, the new claims do not use the phrase “information necessary for performing a job” but rather use the recitation (e.g. Claim 10) “information...regarding only the user and persons directly and indirectly managed by the user.”

It is thus submitted that Applicant’s written description and claims fully satisfy the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2-28-05

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257